

Remarks/Arguments

This Response is considered fully responsive to the Office Action mailed September 11, 2007. Claims 1- 24 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 20 and 23 stand rejected. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 stand objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to incorporate the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. A section of the specification has been amended. Claims 1 and 9-17 have been amended herein. No claims have been canceled. No new claims have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 20 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,449,111 to Kool (hereafter “Kool”). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 each recite that each logical zone of the plurality of logical zones extends radially from a common inner diameter to a common outer diameter of the storage medium. In contrast, the data frames, which the Office appears to equate to the recited logical zones, disclosed in Kool are writeable areas between two servo sectors in the same track. Kool at col. 1, line 37 and FIG. 4A. While Kool does discuss logical zones, Kool defines those logical zones as “a set of tracks with the same track format,” rather than a logical zone that extends radially from a common inner diameter to a common outer diameter of the storage medium. Neither the data frames nor the logical zones disclosed by Kool extend radially from a common inner diameter to a common outer diameter of the storage medium. Accordingly, Kool fails to disclose or suggest the plurality of logical zones as recited in claims 1, 9, and 17.

Furthermore, claims 1 and 9 recite that data from a first stream of data is written within determined bounds of a first logical zone, wherein the bounds of the first logical zone are determined by an amount of time for rotating through the first logical zone based on a rotational speed of the storage medium and a size of the first logical zone. Also, claim 17 recites writing data from a first stream of data to a first logical zone of the plurality of logical zones for up to an amount of time corresponding to a rotational speed of the storage medium and a size of the first logical zone. While the Office contends that Kool at col. 6, lines 6-15 suggests that these limitations are well known in the art, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Kool at col. 6, lines 6-15 explicitly discusses the partitioning of tracks on a media into physical zones, rather than logical zones. Kool states that “the number of data frames on a track and the number of data sectors per data frame depends on the rotational velocity and bit density of the track.” Kool at col. 6, lines 6-8. Kool fails to disclose the determination of bounds of a logical zone in any manner, and certainly does not suggest determining the bounds of the first logical zone by an amount of time for rotating through the first logical zone based on a rotational speed of the storage medium and a size of the first logical zone, as recited in the claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Okada fails to anticipate or make obvious the invention of claims 1, 9, and 17, and allowance of claims 1, 9 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 7 depend from claim 1. Claims 12 and 15 depend from claim 9. Claims 20 and 23 depend from claim 17. The base claims for each of claims 4, 7, 12, 15, 20 and 23 are believed to be allowable. Therefore, each of claims 4, 7, 12, 15, 20 and 23 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Therefore, allowance of claims 4, 7, 12, 15, 20 and 23 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In light of the arguments and amendments made herein, the Applicant believes that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 are allowable in their current form. Thus, Applicant respectfully request that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 be allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant have fully responded to each and every objection and rejection in the Office action dated September 11, 2007 and believe that claims 1-24 are in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicant believes no other fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3199 as necessary.

If the Office believes any issues could be resolved via a telephone interview, the Office is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Date: November 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard J. Holzer, Jr./
Richard J. Holzer, Jr., Reg. No. 42,668
Attorney for Applicant
USPTO Customer No. 64776

HENSLEY KIM & HOLZER, LLC
1660 Lincoln Street, Suite 3000
Denver, Colorado 80264
Tel: 720-377-0770
Fax: 720-377-0777